DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 955 SP 021 711

TITLE	A Learning Laboratory Model: Teacher Corps Intervention Activities at Springfield Junior High School. Teacher Corps Program '79. The University of Toledo/Springfield Local Schools.
INSTITUTION	Toledo Univ., Ohio. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE	Sep 81
NOTE	38p.; Some of the appended pages contain broken type and will be marginally legible. For related documents, see SP 021 705-717.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Junior High Schools; *Learning Laboratories; *Low Achievement; Mathematics Instruction; Parent Participation; Program Evaluation; Reading Instruction; *Remedial Programs; *Student Improvement; Student Motivation; *Teacher Interns
IDENTIFIERS	Teacher Corps; University of Toledo Springfield Local Schools Pro

ABSTRACT

This report: (1) describes the operation of a junior high school learning laboratory for low achieving students; and (2) presents findings and conclusions of an assessment of its impact. Seventh and eighth grade students with average abilities but with failing marks in mathematics, social studies and science, and reading were participants. These students were not receiving special assistance through other remedial programs. Teacher Corps interns worked under the guidance of supervisory team leaders, and were responsible for creating an attractive learning environment, acting as liaison between the lab and the students' teachers, and writing individual objectives for students. Students were assigned to a 4-hour block in the laboratory, which was headed by a school faculty member, and time was provided for teachers to meet with students to reinforce personal relationships and review student progress. Descriptions are given of specific responsibilities of the interns and supervisors and of special events carried out in the lab. Tables present data on: (1) student schedules; (2) student absences by grading period; (3) student assignments; (4) pre- and post-test grade level scores on reading, spelling, and mathematics; (5) final grades by subject; (6) intern supervisory feedback; (7) general staff feedback; and (8) students' academic and attitudinal changes perceived by teachers. A synthesis of material contained in the tables is presented. Comments and opinions on the lab from participants and parents are included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225955

Teacher Corps * Program '79
The University of Toledo/
Springfield Local Schools

A Learning Laboratory Model:

TEACHER CORPS INTERVENTION ACTIVITIES AT SPRINGFIELD JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Joan D. Inglis
Project Director

Ralph B. Carroll
On-Site Coordinator/Team Leader

James R. Gress
Program Developer/Documentor

Lynn Haffey
Ellen Judd
Denise Lemerand
Aurelio Sanchez, Jr.
Project Interns

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James R. Gress

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

September, 1981

SP 021 711

The initial proposal for a Teacher Corps project by The University of Toledo and Springfield Local Schools (1978) was designed to address problems of school climate at Springfield Junior High School. As stated in the proposal (pp. 1, 6):

> The basic problem addressed by this proposal is low achievement by students in the Junior High. Low Achievement on standardized tests and excessive numbers of unsatisfactory grades are matters of concern to students, teachers and parents alike. Directly related to this problem is the perception of the teaching staff that they have been unable to reverse this problem. For example, they are anxious to learn what can be done to improve student motivation for learning.
>
> Springfield Junior High School becomes the training complex for upgrading staff development with particular emphasis in CBTE which implies interdisciplinary training approaches. The possibility of bringing this about through a "school within a school" idea will need to be carefully explored during the planning year. But it does seem apparent that changes in school organization will need to be explored. Organizational changes are not a remote dream.

The 1978 proposal pointed out, with respect to standardized Education Development Test scores, that (p. 14):

> A regressive pattern is emerging wherein instead of enhancing their study in abilities and basic skills, the largest group is moving backward. Noteworthy is the data which illustrate that the 9th grade results are even lower than the 7th grade, particularly in reading and math which are suggestive for the direction of this project.

That proposal also pointed out that, at that time, Junior High students were receiving disproportionately large percentages of "unsatisfactory" grades. The proposal continued (p. 17):

> Whether the poor grades are reflective of poor scholarship, inappropriate education criteria, some other factor or combination of factors remains to be seen.

Changes in the Teacher Corps model mandated by federal legislation for Programs '78 and '79 included important differences from the twelve previous project cycles, and they resulted in modification and re-submission

of a UT/Springfield proposal (1979). Improvement of school climate at the Junior High continues to be an important focus for the local project.

It was in these contexts that the development of a Learning Laboratory was initiated as a "school within a school" at Springfield Junior High School and the Project interns given joint responsibility with a Jr. High teacher for organizing and maintaining the Lab during the initial January-March, 1981, period. The purpose of this report is to describe the Learning Laboratory and its operation and to present findings and conclusions of a comprehensive assessment of the Lab and its impact.

The Learning Laboratory

During the first week of January, 1981, Project and Junior High personnel met in a series of meetings which resulted in agreements to establish a Learning Laboratory within the Junior High School. Those involved in the meetings, at one time or another, included the Project Director, On-Site Coordinator, Program Development Specialist/Documentor, the four Interns, the Junior High Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, and Department Chairpersons. Project personnel also met with the Local Superintendent and Director of Instruction and Personnel in this regard. The initial agreements reached in these meetings were two: (1) to establish the Lab for Identified "average ability" seventh and eighth graders who had received failing grades in the "basic subject areas for the school's first and second grading periods and who likely would continue to fail and, eventually, be retained at present grade levels, (2) to operate the Lab which would be housed in a second-floor "study hall" adjacent to the Reading Center during the school's third, fourth, fifth and sixth periods daily for at least the remainder of the school's third grading period which coincided, approximately, with the remainder of the Project's (University's) Winter Quarter.

At the same time, the roles of the Project interns and of the Intern Supervisory Team were clarified. A number of role responsibilities were agreed upon, including the following:

The Intern Role

1. Each intern will help the School meet its project goals. (Project goals are those which each school has identified as top priorities. The major project goals for the Junior High School are related to:
   a. School climate and discipline;
   b. Study skills.
   Each intern will be working with the Junior High School staff to achieve the study skills goals).
2. Each intern will work one-half day, 5 days a week. (The schedule will depend on the best arrangement for the Junior High).
3. Each intern will work with both individual teachers and departments as best suits school needs and individual intern expertise.
4. Each intern will work as a member of three teams:
   a. The Intern team;
   b. The school team;
   c. The project team.
5. Each intern will work under the guidance of the Team Leader.
6. Each intern will be exposed to as many situations, teaching styles and growth experiences as possible.
7. Each intern will have field experiences which are integral to course work offered on-site and on campus when possible.

The Supervisory Team Role

1. The Supervisory Team will provide a smooth entry into the project school.
2. The Supervisory Team will facilitate a continuing positive environment in which each intern functions.
3. The Supervisory Team will assist interns in making an efficient and worthwhile use of time.
4. The Supervisory Team will provide on-going feedback to interns regarding their effectiveness.
5. The Supervisory Team will provide on-going feedback to the project staff regarding intern effectiveness.
6. The Supervisory Team will assist the interns to become integrated members of the school team.
7. The Supervisory Team will keep department colleagues informed about all intern activities.
8. The Supervisory Team will plan with interns, project staff and consultants on intern activities.

As described in the Project's 1981-82 Continuation Proposal (pp. 23-25):

> ...(the) cadre of seventh and eight graders (identified were students of) average abilities who nevertheless have received F and D marks in basic subjects (mathematics, social studies and science) and Us in reading. Reasons for failing appeared to be lack of attendance, refusal to attend to assignments, little respect for

self or school, and a lack of skills necessary to achieve success. These students (were)...not receiving special assistance through EMR or MSBH programs, ...remedial reading programs, or ...tutors.

Special arrangements included the following:

1. The students were identified by both the counselor and teachers.

2. Students were rescheduled for art, music, shop, etc., in order to free a four hour block, periods three, four, five and six, to which these students were assigned after parent approval.

3. An outstanding faculty member who has certification in reading, math and social studies agreed to operate as Head Teacher for the Lab. He was relieved from former responsibilities in periods four, five, six, and seven, and the school district purchased his conference time.

4. A study hall facility was cleared to provide space. The Guidance Counselor, Team Leader, Head Teacher and Interns removed desks, cleaned tables and chairs, and moved them into the space. Interns immediately set about creating an attractive physical learning environment.

5. Each intern was assigned to one of the four departments, English, Science, Social Studies and Math, in order to provide a liaison between the Lab and the students' teachers.

6. Each intern gathered data about students from permanent records and in interviews with the teachers in order to write individual objectives for the students.

7. Time was provided for each teacher to meet with his/her students, now in the Lab, in order to reinforce teacher interest in the student and to review his/her progress.

The Head Teacher and the interns organized a daily schedule during which study skills in the content areas (previously) taught in regular classrooms ...(were) taught (in the Lab), and many activities focusing on developing worthwhile attitudes to self, society and school ...fostered. (Each students daily schedule is contained in Table I of Exhibit A.)

A system of rewards for attendance, promptness, task completion, and so on, ...(was) established. The classroom rules were developed by the students, interns and Head Teacher and ...varied from those for regular classrooms although all students ...(were) required to adhere to building rules.

As pointed out, extensive discussion by the Interns, the Project Staff, and the Intern Supervisory Team resulted in a number of pre-assessment and other initial activities in the Learning Laboratory, including the following:

1. Case study for each student including interviews;
2. Each regular teacher to identify specific objectives;
3. Contract with teachers and students;
4. Get acquainted with each student independently and perhaps "re-negotiate" objectives (see #2);
5. School's cumulative records to be made available to interns;
6. Home visits by intern teams where feasible;
7. Initial get-acquainted activities in Lab;
8. Use of "behavior mod" activities to establish positive climate, facilitate some successes;
9. Use of community "resource" persons re: "school and the 'real world' (job market)."

Seven seventh-graders and ten eighth-graders participated in the Lab during third, fourth, fifth, and sixth periods each day (see Table I in Exhibit A.) Four seventh-graders and one eighth-grader participated during three of these four periods, and the remaining three students participated during two of the four periods involved.

The Lab was operated by the interns and head teacher from January 26th through March 27th. An "open house" for other Junior High staffers was held on January 30th, and the Lab offered the identified students, in addition to its "regular activities," uninterrupted sustained silent reading, "class meetings" and other group activities, some individual counseling, and a number of "special events."*

In addition to support from the Project Staff, Intern Supervisory Team and other Junior High staff, the interns received assistance from Professor Mary Jo Henning (UT) in designing basic skills instruction.

---

*For additional details of the Lab's daily operation, see The University of Toledo/Springfield Local Schools Project, Teacher Corps -- Program '79, "Intern Log for Springfield Junior High," January, February and March, 1981.

"Special events" carried out in the Learning Labs included a Parents Day reception, a visit by UT basketball players Harvey Knuckles and Mitch Seemann, a field trip to Greenfield Village and the Ford Museum, a presentation by community Civil War buff Wayne Dennis, and a luncheon at a local "Pizza Inn."

The open house utilized the format for similar Jr. High receptions for parents of "honor roll" students, and it featured remarks to the Lab participants and parents by Springfield School Board President Ruth Smith. Mrs. Smith's positive assessment of the event is Exhibit B (attached). The visit by Knuckles and Seemann focused on informal discussion of goal-setting and achievement. The Greenfield, Michigan, trip was a "first" such experience for some students, and the students voluntarily acknowledged the efforts of school personnel in this regard. Captain Dennis' presentation featured Civil War military costume and paraphernalia, and he pointed out the value of language skills gained late in his own life. The "Pizza Inn" luncheon was a culminating event for the Lab's initial operation with Teacher Corps support and was followed by presentation of a "Certificate of Recognition" for each student participant (Exhibit C).

Assessment of the Laboratory

A variety of changes were facilitated by the Learning Laboratory. Some changes may be measurable by standardized tests; some are not. Therefore, a variety of data and statistics were utilized to describe changes which were perceived. These data and statistics included:

1. Behavior as well as academic changes;
2. Attitudinal changes;
3. Student comments;
4. Teacher comments;
5. Parent comments.

In addition, the interns' respective perceptions of the Laboratory and its impact were examined. The data and statisitcs utilized to describe Learning Lab changes are displayed in Tables II through VIII in Exhibit A and in Exhibits D through G attached. The following elaborates and synthesizes that material.

Table II displays absences, for both seventh- and eighth-graders, during the third grading period for which they were involved in the Lab. On the average, absenteeism decreased by three days per student for seventh-grade participants and by one-half day for eighth-grade participants.

Table III displays numbers of assignments requested and completed by the Learning Lab participants in Language Arts (English), Mathematics, Social Studies and Science. On the average, seventh-graders completed 80% of the assignments requested, and eighth-graders completed about 70%.

Table IV displays pre- and post-test scores on the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) administered to Learning Lab students. On the average, seventh-grade students who participated in the Lab scored average gains of 0.24, 0.40, and 0.02 grades, respectively, on the Reading, Spelling and Mathematics subtests. For eighth-grade participants, gains of 0.25 and 0.20 grades, respectively, were scored in Reading and Mathematics while a slight decline (0.05 grade) was scored in Spelling.

Table V displays final third period grades earned by students for Laboratory activities. Criteria utilized for grading recommended to the Head Teacher by the respective interns were the amount of assigned work completed, gains in academic skills and attitudes, and student participation in various dimensions of the Lab. For seventh-graders, average grades of B-, A-, B+ and C, respectively, were given in English, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science. For eigth-graders, average grades given were B-, B, B and C-.

Table VI summarizes feedback form the Intern Supervisory Team members. In general, those who provided the feedback expressed familiarity with, and understanding of, identified aspects of the Lab, and they were most positive about the series of meetings held prior to Lab initiation. Respondents also indicated that they kept colleagues informed about Lab progress and that they supported criteria utilized for student placement. However, they indicated that they and colleagues failed to monitor progress of Lab participants although they did assist the Interns and that they and colleagues were positive about changes in their own classes resulting from the removal of Lab participants. They gave "high marks" to the Interns for their performances in the Learning Laboratory.

Table VII summarizes feedback from other members of the Junior High staff. In general, staffers indicated familiarity with students placed in the Lab as well as with placement criteria. They also concurred with the placement criteria, expressed satisfaction with the performances of the interns and the Lab students, but they indicated that they had given little assistance in that regard. Staffers thought the individual attention and positive support given participants were principal Lab strengths. However, they were least positive about the Lab's day-to-day operation, Lab activities and the support they gave in that respect. They were not as familiar with, or positive about, the Learning Laboratory as responses from the Intern Supervisory Team suggested they might be. Staffers raised question -- and reported dissatisfaction of non-Lab students -- about "special events" in the Lab. Lack of understanding and lack of congruence with Supervisory Team members evidence poor Team communication with other staffers about the Learning Laboratory.

Table VIII displays responses about academic and attitudinal changes among Learning Lab students, and it includes specific comment in that regard offered by Jr. High teachers in whose classes Lab students had participated during the first two school grading periods. In general, respondents were more positive about the progress of eighth-graders than they were about the progress of seventh-graders, but the little response received affords no conclusions about the progress of individual students in this regard.

It may be observed that many of the teachers' positive comments about students' progress prior to the Lab -- like, "His attitude and effort were acceptable... to begin with" -- are not reflected in the grades given these students prior to the Lab.

Exhibit D is an assessment of the Learning Lab submitted by the Junior High Guidance Counselor. It describes a "failure-retention syndrome" and an "overall negativism" at work in the Junior High, and it documents the generally positive impact of the Project's intervention via the Lab. As stated in the assessment (p. 1):

> Since the Teacher Coprs Project Staff has been on the Junior High scene, there has been a great infusion of helpfulness. They have developed strategies which show what can be done to address our problems.

The assessment also points out that a number of other students, parents and school officials have sought additional student placements in the Learning Laboratory.

Unfortunately, the Junior High grading pattern was not impacted as much as might have been anticipated during the Lab's initial operation (see Exhibit E). It would appear that, unless additional positive steps are taken, the grading "curve" utilized by many staffers operates to fail a fixed percentage of students regardless of the student population assessed.

Parent (s) of the Lab participants were contacted in regular parent-teacher conferences, during the Parents Day program, in special conference, in their homes and by telephone. Parent responses to six questions about the Lab were then formulated, synthesized, paraphrased and/or recorded by the interns. Those responses are summarized in Exhibit F.

Parents identified academic and attitudinal difficulties experienced by sons and daughters--chronic for many, acute since coming to the Jr. High for some. Many parents reported receiving positive response about the Lab, especially with respect to "special events." They also reported some positive changes in attitude attributed to the Lab, and they were unanimous in supporting their sons' or daughters' continuing participation in the Lab. For general, parents' responses were considerably more positive about the Learning Laboratory than they were about the Junior High School on the whole.

During the weekend of March 20-21st, the Project Staff met with the Interns. Included in the meeting was a "debriefing" in which individual interns identified perceived strengths and weaknesses of the Learning Lab operation. Among identified strengths were:

1. Interest sparked among some Junior High teachers;
2. Changes among many students and teachers in expectations and responses;
3. Individual attention provided students;
4. Positive reward system;
5. Multiple "chances" provided for students to succeed;
6. Additional assistance;
7. More flexible organization of school activities;
8. Exhibited caring and recognition;
9. Displayed interest in student's feelings, home lives, and so on;
10. Positive thinking.

Among possible weaknesses to be addressed in a refinement of the Laboratory were the following:

1. Possible overaccomodation of student interests;
2. Some environmental overstimulation;
3. Lack of windows and other environmental limitations;

4. Continuation of school suspensions;
5. Lack of team cohesiveness;
6. Some lack of communication and group planning;
7. Unclear school discipline policies and procedures.

Exhibit G contains summary evaluative statements about the Learning Lab formulated by the respective interns. In addition to the strengths already identified, the intern assessments underscore two additional positive impacts: (1) the learning of success itself by many students, some perhaps for the first time, and (2) the learning gains afforded all of those associated with the Laboratory.

Beginning on March 30th, operation of the Learning Lab became the exclusive responsibility of the Jr. High staff. The interns and Project Staff met with the entire Jr. High staff and, subsequently, with those who assumed primary responsibility for the Lab to discuss its operation. Five Jr. High teachers assumed primary responsibility for the Lab which was to be operated for the remainder of the school year. Plans for its continuation for the 1981-82 school year and for other alternative school structures were being explored. On May 18, 1981, all Jr. High staffers visited junior high and middle schools in Ohio and Michigan to explore other possibilities for change. It is anticipated that a number of organizational and curriculum changes may be effected in the Junior High during the next two years.

EXHIBIT A

TABLE I. JUNIOR HIGH STUDENT SCHEDULES FOR LEARNING LABORATORY BY PERIOD.

		Period						
		1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
Seventh Grade								
Student	A*	PE	HE	Sci	LAB	LAB	LAB	Heal/Rdg
Student	B	Mus	Heal/Rdg	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	PE
Student	C	SH	Mth	Mus	LAB	LAB	LAB	Heal/Rdg
Student	D	Mus	Mth	LAB	LAB	LAB	Heal/Rdg	SH
Student	E	Heal/Rdg	Mth	LAB	LAB	LAB	Mus	PE
Student	F	Mus	HE	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	Heal/Rdg
Student	G	Heal/Rdg	HE	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	PE
Student	H	Heal/Rdg	HE	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	SH
Student	I	Art	Rdg	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	SH
Student	J	SH	HE	LAB	Mth	Sci	LAB	Heal/Rdg
Student	K	PE	HE	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	Heal/Rdg
Student	L	Mus	Heal/Rdg	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	PE
Eighth Grade								
Student	M	Rdg	SH	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	PE
Student	N	Rdg	Shp	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	SH
Student	O	Art	Rdg	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	SH
Student	P	Rdg	Art	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	SH
Student	Q	Art	Mth	LAB	Choir	LAB	Sci	Rdg
Student	R	Rdg	Art	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	PE
Student	S	Rdg	Shp	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	SH
Student	T	Art	Rdg	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	SH
Student	U	SH	Eng	LAB	LAB	PE	Shp	SS
Student	V	Shp	Art	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	SH
Student	W	Art	SS	LAB	LAB	Shp	LAB	SH
Student	X	SH	Rdg	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	PE
Student	Y	Rdg	Art	LAB	LAB	LAB	LAB	SH

*Throughout, anonymity for individual Jr. High students has been insured.

TABLE II. ABSENCES FOR JUNIOR HIGH LEARNING LABORATORY STUDENTS BY GRADING PERIOD

	1st period Absences	2nd period Absences	Average	3rd period Absences	Change
Seventh Grade					
Student A	0	1	0.5	0	-0.5
Student B	0	4	2.0	1	-1.0
Student C	5	8	6.5	3	-3.5
Student D	1	0	0.5	1	+0.5
Student E	15	10	12.5	10	-2.5
Student F*	-	-	-	-	-
Student G	5	3	4.0	9	+5.0
Student H	2	1	1.5	6	+4.5
Student I*	-	-	-	-	-
Student J	8	10	9.0	3	-6.0
Student K	21	12	16.5	4	-12.5
Student L	22	14	18.0	3	-15.0
Eighth Grade					
Student M	7	6	6.5	3	-3.5
Student N	4	3	3.5	2	-1.5
Student O	2	5	3.5	5	-1.5
Student P	4	4	4.0	3	-1.0
Student Q	5	4	4.5	5	+0.5
Student R**	-	-	-	0	-
Student S	9	2	5.5	10	+4.5
Student T	2	3	2.5	6	+3.5
Student U	6	10	8.0	9	+1.0
Student V	2	2	2.0	1	-1.0
Student W	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Student X	3	3	3.0	1	-2.0
Student Y	8	14	11.0	11	0.0

*Student transferred during 3rd period
**New student

TABLE III. LEARNING LABORATORY STUDENT ASSIGNMENTS.

	Assignments Requested					Assignments Completed					Completed
	LA	Mth	SS	Sci	Tot	LA	Mth	SS	Sci	Tot	% Total
Seventh Grade											
Student A	31	9	11	**	51	31	6	11	**	48	94.1
Student B	31	9	11	25	76	20	6	10	17	53	69.7
Student C	31	**	11	25	67	27	**	10	17	54	80.6
Student D	31	**	11	25	67	31	**	11	21	63	94.0
Student E	31	**	11	25	67	18	**	10	16	44	65.7
Student F*											
Student G	31	9	11	25	76	30	7	10	18	65	85.5
Student H	31	9	11	***	51	25	8	11	***	44	86.3
Student I*											
Student J	31	**	11	**	42	26	**	10	**	36	85.7
Student K	31	9	11	25	76	10	7	11	15	43	56.6
Student L	31	9	11	25	76	29	9	10	18	66	86.8
Eighth Grade											
Student M	31	18	11	35	95	23	13	5	24	55	57.9
Student N	31	18	11	35	95	23	11	9	19	62	65.3
Student O	31	18	11	35	95	24	13	6	22	65	68.4
Student P	31	18	11	35	95	30	15	9	28	82	86.3
Student Q	31	**	11	**	42	26	**	6	**	32	76.2
Student R	31	18	11	35	95	30	18	8	28	84	88.4
Student S	31	18	11	35	95	30	18	9	20	77	81.1
Student T	31	18	11	35	95	23	12	9	21	65	68.4
Student U	**	***	**	35	35	**	***	**	30	30	85.7
Student V	31	18	11	35	95	26	13	5	18	62	65.3
Student W	31	18	**	35	84	24	17	**	22	63	67.2
Student X	31	18	11	35	95	19	7	6	17	49	51.6
Student Y	31	18	11	35	95	27	8	3	25	63	66.3

* Student transferred
** Continued in regular class for subject
*** No data

TABLE IV. PRE- AND POST-TEST GRADE LEVEL SCORES ON WRAT FOR LEARNING LABORATORY STUDENTS BY SUBTEST.

	Reading			Spelling			Mathematics		
Seventh Grade	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain
Student A	6.5	6.5	0.0	6.2	6.7	0.5	4.5	4.5	0.0
Student B	5.7	4.7	-1.0	4.3	4.8	0.5	4.3	4.3	0.0
Student C	3.6	6.6	3.0	4.1	5.4	1.3	6.0	6.3	0.3
Student D	7.2	7.4	0.2	6.7	6.5	0.2	4.7	4.5	-0.2
Student E	5.1	4.4	-0.7	3.9	4.1	0.2	5.3	5.1	-0.2
Student F*									
Student G	7.4	7.4	0.0	6.4	6.9	0.5	4.3	5.3	1.0
Student H	8.6	9.4	0.8	6.9	7.5	0.6	4.5	4.3	-0.2
Student I*									
Student J	4.7	5.5	0.8	6.2	6.5	0.3	4.3	4.3	0.0
Student K	3.8	3.6	-0.2	3.1	3.5	0.4	3.5	3.5	0.0
Student L	6.9	6.4	-0.5	6.5	6.4	-0.1	5.8	5.3	-0.5
Eighth Grade									
Student M	7.1	7.7	0.6	6.3	5.4	-0.9	4.1	3.7	-0.4
Student N	7.1	8.4	1.3	6.2	6.6	0.4	4.7	4.1	-0.6
Student O	8.6	9.7	1.1	7.1	7.7	0.6	5.5	7.3	1.8
Student P	6.6	6.0	-0.6	6.2	5.4	-0.8	4.3	4.5	0.2
Student Q	8.0	8.0	0.0	6.5	6.9	0.4	5.5	6.3	0.8
Student R	7.9	8.3	0.4	6.7	6.7	0.0	4.5	4.5	0.0
Student S	8.4	8.7	0.3	6.3	7.0	0.7	6.0	7.8	1.8
Student T	7.9	8.3	0.4	6.2	5.4	-0.8	5.3	5.5	0.2
Student U	7.9	8.4	0.5	7.5	6.9	-0.5	5.3	5.8	0.5
Student V	7.4	7.7	0.3	6.5	6.2	-0.3	5.1	5.1	0.0
Student W	8.4	9.5	1.1	6.5	6.5	0.0	5.1	4.5	-0.6
Student X	7.0	4.7	-2.3	5.0	5.4	0.4	4.9	4.5	-0.4
Student Y	8.4	8.5	0.1	6.5	6.8	0.3	6.3	5.5	-0.8

*Student transferred

TABLE V. FINAL GRADES FOR LEARNING LABORATORY STUDENTS FOR THE THIRD GRADING PERIOD BY SUBJECT.

Seventh Grade	Language Arts	Mathematics	Social Studies	Science
Student A	**	A	A	**
Student B	C	A	B	C
Student C	B	**	A	C
Student D	B	**	A	B
Student E	D	**	B	C
Student F*				
Student G	A	A	B	C
Student H	B	A	A	***
Student I*				
Student J	B	**	B	**
Student K	D	C	C	D
Student L	B	A	B	C
Eighth Grade				
Student M	B	C	B	D
Student N	C	C	C	D
Student O	B	A	B	D
Student P	A	A	A	C
Student Q	B	**	B	**
Student R	A	B	A	B
Student S	A	A	A	D
Student T	C	A	A	D
Student U	**	B	**	B
Student V	C	C	B	D
Student W	B	A	**	C
Student X	D	D	D	D
Student Y	C	B	B	C

*Student transferred
**Continued in regular class for subject

TABLE VI. INTERN SUPERVISORY TEAM FEEDBACK.

	N Responses*							
	6	5	4	3	2	1	NR	$\bar{X}$
1. I am generally familiar with the following aspects of the Learning Laboratory:								
a. the criteria for placing students in the Lab when it began.	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	5.00
b. the Junior High students assigned it.	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	5.25
c. the activities planned and carried out by the Teacher Corps interns.	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	4.25
d. the day-to-day operation.	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	5.00
2. The planning mettings held prior to the establishment of the Lab								
a. allowed adequate consideration of the issues involved.	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	3.75
b. gave opportunity for input from all those involved.	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	4.00
3. I kept other teachers informed as details of the Lab were planned and carried out.	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	4.50
4. The criteria for placing students in the Lab initially were appropriate.	2	-	-	-	-	1	1	4.33
5. Teachers to whom Lab participants had been assigned prior to its establishment								
a. continued to monitor student progress in their respective areas.	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	2.33
b. have been favorably impressed by progress made by students.	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	2.33
c. have reported positive changes among <u>other</u> students in their classes.	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	4.00
d. assisted the interns in appropriate ways.	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	4.33
6. The Teacher Corps interns have performed effecitvely during their assignment to the Junior High.	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	4.75

6 = strongly agree; 5 = moderately agree; 4 = agree; 3 = disagree; 2 = moderately disagree; 1 = strongly disagree; NR = no response (not included in calculating $\bar{X}$).

Laboratory Strengths

Helping the lab students develop a more positive attitude toward school.

Not sure.

Laboratory Weaknesses

Not sure---Are we really helping these students? I don't think so.

None

TABLE VII. GENERAL STAFF FEEDBACK--SPRINGFIELD JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

	N Responses							
	6	5	4	3	2	1	NR	$\bar{X}$
1. I am generally familiar with the following aspects of the Learning Laboratory:								
a. the criteria for placing students in the Lab when it began.	2	3	3	1	1	-	-	4.40
b. the Junior High students assigned it.	1	3	4	-	2	-	-	4.10
c. the activities planned and carried out by the Teacher Corps interns.	2	-	2	-	2	4	-	2.80
2. The criteria for placing students in the Lab initially were appropriate	2	2	1	2	-	2	1	3.78
3. The day-to-day operation of the Lab has been accomplished smoothly.	-	2	2	1	1	3	1	2.89
4. The Teacher Corps interns have performed effectively during their assignment to the Junior High.	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	3.56
5. I have given assistance to the Teacher Corps interns in operation of the Lab.	-	2	2	-	1	-	1	2.67
6. I have been favorably impressed with progress made by students in the Lab.	2	-	3	2	1	2	-	3.40

Laboratory Strengths

They at least were trying to work with kids that we regular classroom teachers seemed incapable of working with.

Giving students individual attention when they need it.

The special help that was given to these students.

To allow those students to finally get some positive attention from teachers and to establish rapport with adults.

To allow them to work at a slower and more realistic pace and to enable them to "pass" their subjects.

Having the T.U. ball players in was a good idea. The kids in the regular classes were dying to hear them.

Jack Wallington and the enthusiasm of the interns.

It was exciting to have something experimental going on (and continuing).

Laboratory Strengths (cont'd.)

Students learned how to do school work and tackle the main business at hand.

Laboratory Weaknesses

Students given too much hall freedom.

To the students in regular classes it didn't seem fair that the "worst" kids should have privileges like Pizza Inn, field trip, etc.

No doors on room used. Lots of commotion by doorway at times. Distracting for learning lab kids.

The old unsolved question: At this age, is it better to keep them in regular classes so they can adjust to "the real world?" The "special" classification they receive hurts in a way--other kids look down(?) at them. As an example--LD Tutor, I always wondered if removing that LD label would have sometimes helped more than special tutoring did. Also, if there are always special programs, when will regular teachers be forced to individualize? (When they have small classes?)

Putting all F students in the same class may not be the best idea. This forms a group or gang of undesirables that may become more of a problem (behavior wise).

The interns were not strict enough. They tried to be "buddies" to the students. Thus, the students ran rampant except when Jack Wallington was in the room.

Students were allowed more privileges than those in regular classes (i.e. Pizza Hut, class parties, guest speakers--B.B. players.) This complaint was also coming from the students in the honors sections.

Lack of communication between Teacher Corps and Jr. high teachers. Lack of cooperation. Superior attitudes of Teacher Corps interns.

From talking to the students of mine that were placed there, the chief complaint was that they were allowed to jack around too much. Lack of discipline in other words.

Other Comments

I know very little about the Learning Lab.

I have no student who participates in it.

TABLE VIII. LEARNING LABORATORY STUDENT CHANGES IN ACADEMIC AND ATTITUDINAL PROGRESS PERCEIVED BY "REGULAR" JUNIOR HIGH TEACHERS (N =)

	N Responses - Academic								N Responses - Attitudinal							
Seventh Grade	6	5	4	3	2	1	NR	$\bar{X}$	6	5	4	3	2	1	NR	$\bar{X}$
Student A	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	3.00	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	3.00
Student B	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1.00	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3.00
Student C	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1.50	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1.50
Student D	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4.00	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1.00
Student E	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	3.50	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	3.50
Student F*																
Student G	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	2.50	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	4.50
Student H	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1.00	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4.00
Student I*																
Student J	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	3.00	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	3.00
Student K	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1.00
Student L	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2.00	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	2.50
Eighth Grade																
Student M	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4.00	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4.00
Student N	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	4.50	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	3.50
Student O	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	3.00	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	3.00
Student P	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	3.00	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	3.00
Student Q	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	4.00	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	4.00
Student R	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	4.00	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	4.00
Student S	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	3.00	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2.50
Student T	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	3.50	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	3.50
Student U	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	5.50	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	5.00
Student V	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	5.00	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	4.00
Student W	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	4.00	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	4.00
Student X	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3.00	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3.00
Student Y	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	4.00	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	4.00

*Student transferred during third period.

Comment(s)

Student A: No longer in class.

Student F: He's gone!

Student J. She can work when she feels like it but otherwise she can be stubbornly turned off.

Student M: His attitude and effort were acceptable in here to begin with and he maintained those qualities. He does his work willingly and seems to enjoy getting recognition for good work.

Student N: He remains rather passive choosing to depend upon others for direction (and answers?) rather than to strive for independence. Was no behavior problem to begin with. He doesn't <u>really</u> seem to understand what's going on (organization of lab materials, reading the schedule, etc.). He seems to drift away from the work at hand.

Student O: Works when <u>he</u> wants. Failed this grading period in my class.

He does what is required and seems to enjoy receiving high scores when he does. He is "always on the verge" of "heading the wrong way" behaviorally. He's <u>very sensitive</u> to criticism and seems to wait for opportunities to become defensive about any criticism. He responds well to positive reinforcement.

Student P: She has always been good in my class.

She doesn't strive toward independence or take on responsibility. She depends upon others to help her through the rdg. lab. She talks with others, combs hair, etc., instead of sticking to her work. She doesn't seem responsive to special help or attention from me. She had expressed a favorable attitude toward the learning lab because she said she was "passing" now. No obvious problem at beginning, but her attitude behavior bothers me now.

Student Q: He is doing the same now as he has been. He is passing but slacks up from time to time.

He has settled down some and seems to be controlling his robust sense of humor somewhat. After he settles down, he attempts the work. He works very slowly.

Student R: His attitude is good. He seems to try to do a good job in his work. He and another Learning Lab student are in the same group and they horse around at times but they are not obnoxious. Perhaps if he could slow down in his work, his progress would be even better.

He has always been a pretty good worker. There hasn't been any change in that fact.

Student S: He expressed a favorable attitude toward the learning lab because he said he was finally "passing." In class, he seems to show less and less interest in doing the work independently. However, he responds well to individual attention. (When I sit down and listen to him read orally, when I comment that his "averaging" of the grades has been accurate). He seems to be happy with his capability in math (at least the few computations we work on in class). He seems, overall, more interested in his tapes and stereos.

Student T: Poor worker with a rather poor attitude.

If he were not in here with Chuck Wilmoth, I think he would <u>really</u> be making progress. He <u>acts</u> like he knows a lot less than he does (at least in rdg. compre. and study skills, etc.). He seemed to like the rapport developed in the learning lab with the teachers. I think he really has shown self-control regarding his behavior.

Student U: Her attitude has always been good and still is--her academic achievement is also the same as before.

Student V: He is a border line student in any class. No apparent change.

Student W: He does average work in my class.

I haven't noticed any change in attitude or academics. He hasn't had any problems in my classroom with either of the above areas since the beginning of the 2nd quarter. His participation continues to be <u>good</u>. His <u>attitude</u> is good. And although he has gotten a "C" the last 2 quarters, he has proven he can do A & B work when he wants to. He seems well adjusted and we get along well.

Student X: His attitude & behavior have had their ups & downs. He'll go great for a week, then go back to "acting & talking dumb and being obnoxious." I gave him rewards for good behavior. (After talking with his Dad, we settled on a reward system.) He works slowly and is dependent on someone else to help him.

Student Y: She has been doing better due to the fact that she has been coming to school lately.

She usually seems rather passive and dependent upon her group. She does her work and never is a behavior problem. She's agreeable. She works slowly but steadily.

EXHIBIT B

TO KEEP YOU POSTED

On February 27, 1981 I attended the Learning and Class pilot project with Teacher Corps to speak to the Class at the Conclusion of the semester.

The students were seated and orderly with teachers, the school Counselor, Principal and some of their parents in attendance. The behavior for students who are not progressing with acceptable academic standards was discussed. I talked with the students and some responses were lively and with no reservations, others "Shot" to their out their responses or frustrations, attitudes toward the Program Study Procedures. The Student Award Class award to be announced, to first & yearly Report Card.

The social time of punch and Cookies was open and friendly. The students ranged from shy reserved to open to talk with me. Many expressed there to express in their Studies.

Overall I felt it was a positive experience for all, Students, parents, Staff and myself.

Sincerely

Mrs Ruth C Smith

EXHIBIT C

The University of Toledo/Springfield Local Schools

Teacher Corps. Project

This

Certificate of Recognition

is awarded to

_____

For Participation, Effort, Involvement and Achievement In

the

Learning Laboratory, Springfield Junior High School

With best wishes, it is given at Holland, Ohio

on the 27th day of March, 1981

Lynn Haffey, Teacher	Jack Wallington, Coordinator	Ellen Judd, Teacher
Denise Lemerand, Teacher	Gerald Hiltman, Guidance Counselor	Aurelio Sanchez Jr., Teacher

W. Fred Dais, Principal

Thru you, the school has taken a positive step in meeting your educational needs

EXHIBIT D
March 25, 1981

TO: Teacher Crops Staff

FROM: Gerald J. Hiltman

RE: The Junior High School Learning Laboratory

In 1977-78 when problem areas in the Junior High were under heavy discussion, Springfield Schools was fortunate to enlist the direct aid of The University of Toledo. The initial liaison provided by Dr. Ed Nussel led to extensive study of the identified problem areas and development of a Teacher Corps proposal addressing them.

Of particular concern at the time was the number of average ability students who, for various reasons, could not or would not "handle" the mini-high school setting which was then the dominant mode for the Junior High. Low achievement, absenteeism and repeated behavior problems which lead to failure and repeated retentions resulted.

In addition, this failure-retention syndrome caused additional alarm for some because of its escalation. An overall negativism in the building reinforced the syndrome as well.

To address this escalating problem, the idea of a self-contained classroom in which identified students would be housed was presented. It was hoped that, in this setting, it would be possible to deal with these students productively.

This is how I view the Learning Laboratory. It is a positive way for dealing with the identified concerns, an alternative for overcoming the difficulties involved.

Since the Teacher Corps Project Staff has been on the Junior High scene, there has been a great infusion of helpfulness. They have developed strategies which show what can be done to address our problems.

A word is in order concerning the twenty-three students who were selected for the Lab and the procedure used to identify them. Each of the twenty-three:

a. possesses average ability;

b. is definitely in danger of failing;

c. would have repeated his/her present grade.

When the students were told about the Lab, they all agreed to cooperate and work at it. A couple of them were reluctant initially. Others were very excited about it and couldn't wait until the Lab got underway.

Certified letters were sent to parents explaining what was to be undertaken. Since then, parents of students not in the Lab have requested that their sons or daughters be placed in it. The county attendance officer requested a possible student placement. Other students in the building have requested acceptance into the Lab to avoid pending failure.

Many special activities were planned, took place and were quite successful in the Lab, e.g., Parent Visitation Day, guest speakers and a trip to Greenfield Village. The conduct of the students during these events was good.

Upon visiting the Lab, one notices the walls highly decorated with students' art work and projects. It can quickly be seen that students <u>are</u> doing their school work.

Parents have been involved in the Lab through phone calls, conferences and home visits.

These students are very difficult students. But they are now doing school work. None of the preceding events would have happened without the Learning Lab effort.

EXHIBIT E April 13, 1981

SOME OBSERVATIONS ABOUT "UNSATS"
AT SPRINGFIELD JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Thus far during the current school year, a total of 747 Reports of Unsatisfactory Progress ("Unsats") have been issued by teachers at Springfield Junior High for the respective reporting periods -- 299 (1st Quarter), 231 (2nd Quarter) and 217 (3rd Quarter).

Given an average enrollment of 491 students for the same period, the rate of unsatisfactory progress -- or "failure rate" -- at the Junior High has been approximately 0.5 subjects per student, or one subject for every other student. More significantly, 149, 129 and 150 students received "Unsats" in the respective quarters -- a "failure rate" of 30% or more of the student body.

Significant variation among teachers can be observed. On the one hand, seven teachers issued no "Unsats" in any quarter, and six others issued less than ten "Unsats" for all three quarters. On the other hand, two teachers issued twenty or more "Unsats" each per quarter, and five other teachers issued twenty or more each in at least one quarter. Thus, the quarterly "failure rate" has varied between zero and 50% or more of the students assigned individual teachers.

The Learning Lab removed from the student population twenty-three students who, together, accounted for 90 of 231 "Unsats" issued for the second quarter this year. Given a "failure rate" of 0.5 subjects per student, it might have been predicted that the number of "Unsats" for students enrolled in the third quarter -- less approximately 90 -- would have been about 155. As indicated above, the reported "Unsats" totaled 217 -- approximately 40% more than expected.

Or, given an average "failure rate" of 30% of the students regularly enrolled, it might have been predicted that the number of non-Learning Lab students receiving "Unsats" for the third quarter would have been about 120. As indicated, the actual number was 150 -- 25% more than expected. These findings underscore serious question about the rate of reported student failure at the Junior High.

Finally, experience with the twenty-three students in the Learning Lab has raised these other questions about "Unsats" as well:

1. What are the criteria for assessing student progress?

2. Is each student's progress assessed only in terms of the identified criteria or is it also assessed in terms of the progress of other students?

3. Are there legitimate reasons why progress for the same students can vary so widely from teacher to teacher?

4. Is there legitimate reason why students in programs such as the Reading Laboratory can fail to make "satisfactory progress"?

5. Who determines criteria and who assesses students receiving LD tutoring?

EXHIBIT F

SUMMARY OF PARENTS' COMMENTS

What have been the major "stumbling blocks" your son/daughter has encountered in school in the past?

". . . problems learning" (in general); "hard time learning." "Since the Lab,

". . . can do work with his hands, but does not like to do work from a book . . . always has had bad grades."

". . . (has lived) all over - - four years in Georgia, two in Michigan, three at Springfield."

". . . talking back and smarting off to teachers."

". . . having a hard time understanding English, science, social studies."

". . . has always had problems . . . feels he needs (better) math skills."

". . . must learn to work for herself."

". . . his reading ability."

". . . divorce in the family."

". . . teachers who don't understand him. . . getting into trouble . . . wrong crowd."

". . . teachers' attitude"

". . . a short attention span."

"She just doesn't care about school."

". . . problems started about the age of six when his parents got a divorce."

"I have really had to keep in touch with his teachers all through school."

"Until the seventh grade, he was always a good student. Now, he has a bad attitude about school and doing his work."

". . . only experienced trouble beginning the first of this school year."

Comments continued -

What "reports" about the Learning Lab have your son/daughter brought home?

"She reports about the Lab . . . is talking about school, and her actions have improved."

"She enjoys the teachers and the time she spends in it."

"He enjoys the Lab and would want to be in it again."

". . . enjoys . . . likes the teachers."

". . . that she was going to be (placed) in Lab."

"She says things are perfect. She has done better this quarter than at any time in Junior High."

"Not too many reports. He pretends to be a 'big shot' -- a wise guy."

". . . not until after the conferences."

"He likes it better than his regular classes. The teachers take more time. He is doing better now."

Has your son/daughter had anything to say at home about some of the "special" things which have happened in the Learning Lab?

1. Harvey Knuckles and Mitch Seemann visit
2. Mrs. Ruth Smith's presentation and parent reception
3. Captain Wayne Dennis "Civil War" presentation
4. Greenfield Village tour

". . . mentioned that she had her picture taken with basketball players. . . (was) enthused."

". . . was upset. . . (that he) had to be absent on the day the UT basketball players came to the Lab."

". . . has mentioned and seemed interested."

"She was excited about meeting the two 'Rockets' players and is looking forward to Greenfield Village."

". . . enjoyed the basketball players' coming in."

". . . really was excited about 'open house' and trip to Greenfield Village."

". . . mentioned UT players, 'open house,' Greenfield Village trip."

Comments continued -

". . . excited about Greenfield trip."

". . . excited about receiving autographs from the basketball players."

"She did give notice about Greenfield Village."

"Yes. He's spoken about all of them, expecially the basketball player, Harvey Knuckles."

"Yes. . . Greenfield Village and Harvey Knuckles."

"He wants to go to Greenfield Village and was excited about Harvey Knuckles' coming out."

What differences, if any, have you observed in your son/daughter's attitude and/or behavior since the Lab was initiated?

"Since the Lab, she is able to do the work. . . . whole attitude has changed - - used to be 'I can't do it;' different now."

". . . better behavior"

". . . better attitude. . . (but) still afraid she will be held back"

"The Lab has been a help."

". . . more interested in school"

". . . more enthused about going to school"

". . . more interested in subjects (math and science)"

". . . seems to think grades are getting better"

". . . seems to do more school work"

". . . likes to go to school"

"So far, I'm pleased. (She) is interested in her homework and I don't have to get on her back to get it finished."

"His grades are coming up, and his study habits have improved tremendously. He likes his teachers a lot."

". . . seems to be more interested in school, more interested in his work"

Would you want your son/daughter to continue in the Learning Lab if that opportunity were available?

Comments continued -

"Definitely!"

"Yes."

"Yes."

"It would be his choice as it was for this quarter."

"She feels . . . it has helped her, and I do too. I know she would want to continue in a class like that. Yes, most definitely. . ."

"We want it to continue."

"Yes. Individual attention seems to show concern and produce motivation."

"Yes."

"Yes."

"Yes, if it would help in school (generally)."

"Yes. He's getting the attention which helps him to work."

"Yes."

"Oh yes, I would like it definitely - - absolutely!"

"Don't think it would hurt."

"Yes, I would like it to continue. I think it is fantastic."

"Yes, I think this program is really helping (him)."

What are some additional things, if any, which Springfield Schools might do to meet your son/daughter's needs more effectively?

"I think the Lab is fantastic. . . too bad a program was not started sooner."

". . . has been grounded all year because of his grades, and that has been no help in getting him to get better grades."

"Keep her in good group, away from bad kids. She seems to like her teachers."

". . . have all her classes in the Learning Lab."

". . . get back to teaching 'basic skills'."

". . . (would) like to see school attitude change."

Comments continued -

"The schools have a 'don't care' attitude."

"No, not really. At first I thought it was for 'retards.' Later, when I found out it was not, I accepted the Learning Lab."

Additional Notes:

For one student, phone was disconnected. For another, mother has died; father has drinking problem, and student doesn't want his father contacted.

EXHIBIT G

STATEMENTS ABOUT THE JUNIOR HIGH LEARNING LAB
MADE BY THE TEACHER CORPS INTERNS

In my opinion, I feel that the Learning Lab has been a success. To observe children whose problem was lack of motivation become "turned-on" to school has made the whole experience worthwhile. The frustration that I have felt this quarter in the Learning Lab trying to do what I've felt at times to be almost impossible must have been in a small way, the same feelings of frustration that these students have felt during their life in school. Many of these children have felt success and to see this happening is as exciting for me as it is for them. We may not have reached all of the kids, but one thing I feel is that they all realize that we really care about them and want them to succeed in school and in life. We have shown that we care about them as persons and the funny thing is that they have responded to our caring.

* * *

The plan to help twenty-five Junior High students succeed in school has been accomplished to a remarkable extent. Observing the positive changes in attitude among those students has been especially rewarding in my opinion. I feel that quite a lot has been accomplished in the past seven weeks, and results of the students' work are evidence of the accomplishments.

Of course, there has not been <u>total</u> success in the Learning Lab, but that was to be expected. But observable changes have been observed and documented both in academics, for example, like charting a map or dividing fractions <u>and</u> in attitudes.

The Learning Lab students have felt success. They have found that they <u>can</u> accomplish some things. I believe most are on the way to becoming better students who care about their work and their achievements.

It has been difficult to get the Learning Lab started, but the goal was, and is, a worthwhile one. The initial progress made has made the experience satisfying.

* * *

The Learning Lab is very beneficial to many of the Junior High students. It has allowed these students who lack in the area of study skills to receive the help that they need. A major point in the Learning Lab is that each student receives a large amount of individualized help. Each student can work at the level necessary to reach the educational goals prescribed. As a result the students have developed a healthy rapport with instructors which contributes to a fairly positive learning environment.

The Learning Lab not only aids the students intellectually, but also socially. Many of the students have improved their self concepts through group activity and have learned how to socialize

Statements continued -

appropriately. The Learning Lab is a definite need in the school system.

* * *

The Learning Lab has been a learning experience not only for myself but also for the students. It has been a positive step toward meeting the educational needs of these special students. Motivation and individual attention have been two important concepts utilized in the Lab. The situation has allowed for many students to experience success in the classroom. Also, a change of attitude has been observed in some students toward school - a positive change viewing school as a worthwhile experience. We still have a long way to go in meeting these students' needs but the Lab is a step in the right direction.